

Serial No.: 10/626,580

Docket No.: SI-0039

**Attorney's Docket: RSW920030261US1-02**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of: David L. Kaminsky )	Confirmation No.: 1407
Application No. 10/707,408 )	Group Art Unit: 2451
Filed: December 11, 2003 )	Examiner: Glenford J. Madamba
Title: Method and System to Distribute )	
Policies )	

---

Mail Stop: AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR §41.37**

This appeal is taken from the rejection of claims as set forth in the Office Action of December 29, 2008 (hereinafter the Office Action). In accordance with 37 C.F.R. §41.37, Applicant addresses the following items.

**REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest is International Business Machines Corporation. The assignment document is recorded at Reel 014668 and Frame 0380.

**RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

There are no related appeals and interferences.

### **STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

This is an appeal from the final rejection dated December 29, 2008 of claims 1 – 3, 6 – 15, 18 – 25, 27 – 29, 31 – 38 and 40 – 44. No other claims are pending.

### **STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

There were no amendments made after the final rejection dated December 29, 2008. All amendments filed in this application have been entered. A copy of the appealed claims 1 – 3, 6 – 15, 18 – 25, 27 – 29, 31 – 38 and 40 – 44 appear in the attached Claims Appendix.

### **SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

As stated in 37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(v), Applicant is providing the following explanation of each of the independent claims 1, 10, 23, 28 and 35 involved in this appeal.

This explanation refers to the specification and drawings. The following is merely an example summary and is not intended to be a discussion of the full and entire scope of the claims. Other interpretations, configurations and embodiments are also within the scope of the pending claims.

#### **Independent Claim 1**

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method to distribute policies, comprising: determining if a policy template is present at an enforcement point in response to receiving an identification (ID) assigned to the policy template at the enforcement point (204, 208 and paragraph 0019), wherein the policy template includes a form of “if a first parameter then a second parameter”, the policy template and the parameters being transmitted separately (204, 206, 304, 306 and paragraphs 0019, 0021) to reduce use of communication resources by factoring the template and parameters to be used in the template and to permit different parameters to be transmitted from time to time to replace previous parameters in the policy template without the need of transmitting the

entire policy template again to further reduce use of communication resources; transmitting a query from the enforcement point to a repository (210 and paragraph 0019), where policy templates are stored, in response to the policy template not being present at the enforcement point (208 and paragraph 0019), wherein the query includes the ID assigned to the policy template (102, 104 and paragraphs 0013-0016); receiving the policy template at the enforcement point (212 and paragraph 0019), wherein the policy template is transmitted by the repository in response to the query; and receiving a set of parameters to be used in the policy template at the enforcement point (216, 312 and paragraphs 0020, 0022), wherein the set of parameters are transmitted separately from the policy template (204, 206, 304, 306 and paragraphs 0019, 0021).

#### Independent Claim 10

Independent claim 10 is directed to a method to distribute policies, comprising: defining a policy template associated with each policy (102), wherein the policy template includes a form of "if a first parameter then a second parameter", the policy template and the parameters being transmitted separately (204, 206, 304, 306 and paragraphs 0019, 0021) to reduce use of communication resources by factoring the template and parameters to be used in the template and to permit different parameters to be transmitted from time to time to replace previous parameters in the policy template to change the policy associated with the policy template without the need of transmitting the entire policy or policy template again to further reduce use of communication resources; assigning a unique identification (ID) to each policy template (104); storing each policy template and assigned ID (106 and paragraph 0017); transmitting only the assigned ID to an enforcement point for each policy to be enforced by the enforcement point (204, 304 and paragraphs 0019, 0021), wherein only the ID is transmitted to the enforcement point rather than the policy template to substantially minimize use of data processing and communication resources; determining if the policy template corresponding to any transmitted ID is present at the enforcement point

(208, 308 and paragraph 0019); transmitting a query to a policy template repository in response to the policy template corresponding to any transmitted ID not being present at the enforcement point (210 and paragraph 0019), wherein the query includes the ID for any policy template not present at the enforcement point; and transmitting the policy template from the policy template repository to the enforcement point in response to the query including the ID for the policy template (212 and paragraph 0019).

#### Independent Claim 23

Independent claim 23 is directed to a system to distribute policies, comprising: a policy administrator (402 and paragraph 0023) to define policy templates and to transmit one of an identification (ID) assigned to a policy template or the policy template associated with each policy to be enforced, wherein each policy template includes a form of “if a first parameter then a second parameter”, each policy template and associated parameters being transmitted separately to reduce use of communication resources by factoring the template and associated parameters to be used in the template and to permit different parameters to be transmitted from time to time to replace previous parameters in the policy template without the need of transmitting the entire policy template again to further reduce use of communication resources; an enforcement point (404 and paragraph 0023) to receive the ID assigned to the policy template or the policy template for each policy and to enforce each policy; and a repository (436 and paragraph 0026) to store each policy template and assigned ID, wherein the enforcement point determines if the policy template is present at the enforcement point in response to receiving the ID assigned to the policy template and transmits a query to the repository in response to the policy template not being present at the enforcement point.

#### Independent Claim 28

Independent claim 28 is directed to system to distribute policies, comprising:

means for defining a policy template associated with each policy (402), wherein the policy template includes a form of “if a first parameter then a second parameter”, the policy template and the parameters being transmitted separately to reduce use of communication resources by factoring the template and parameters to be used in the template and to permit different parameters to be transmitted from time to time to replace previous parameters in the policy template without the need of transmitting the entire policy template again to further reduce use of communication resources; means for assigning a unique identification (ID) to each policy template (402 and paragraph 0023); a repository (436 and paragraph 0026) to store each policy template and assigned ID; means for transmitting (410 and paragraph 0023) one of the assigned ID or the policy template for each policy to be enforced; an enforcement point (404) to receive the assigned ID or the policy template for each policy and to enforce each policy; and means for transmitting a query (428 and paragraph 0025) to a policy template repository in response to each policy template corresponding to any transmitted IDs not being present at the enforcement point, wherein the query includes any transmitted IDs for any policy templates not present at the enforcement point.

#### Independent Claim 35

Independent claim 35 is directed to a computer-readable medium (paragraph 0028) having computer-executable instructions for performing a method, comprising: defining a policy template associated with each policy (102 and paragraph 0013), wherein the policy template includes a form of “if a first parameter then a second parameter”, the policy template and the parameters being transmitted separately (204, 206, 304, 306 and paragraphs 0019, 0021) to reduce use of communication resources by factoring the template and parameters to be used in the template and to permit different parameters to be transmitted from time to time to replace previous parameters in the policy template without the need of transmitting the entire policy template again to further reduce use of communication resources; assigning a unique identification (ID) to

each policy template (104 and paragraph 0016); transmitting one of the assigned ID (106) or the policy template to an enforcement point for each policy to be enforced by the enforcement point (204, 304 and paragraphs 0019, 0021); and querying a policy template repository (210 and paragraph 0019) in response to each policy template corresponding to any transmitted IDs not being present at the enforcement point.

### **GROUND OF REJECTION**

Claims 1 – 3, 10 -15, 23 – 25, 27 – 29, 31, 35 – 38 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,032,022 (Shanumgam et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,981,029 (Menditto et al.) and further in view of Applicant's Admitted own Prior Art (AAPA). Claims 6, 18, 32 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanumgam et al. in view of Menditto et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,621,793 (Widegren et al.). Claims 7, 19, 20, 33 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanumgam et al. in view of Menditto et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,510,513 (Danieli). Claims 8, 9, 21, 22, 34 43 and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanumgam et al. in view of Menditto et al. and U.S. Patent No. 2003/0110192 (Valente et al.).

### **ARGUMENTS**

#### **35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections**

The ultimate determination of obviousness under §103 is a question of law. See, In re Leuders, 111 F.3d 1569, 1571, 42USPQ2d 1481, 1482 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The factual predicates underlying an obviousness determination include the scope and content of the prior art, the differences between the prior art and the claimed invention, and the level of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. See, Monarch Knitting Mach. Corp. v. Sulzer Morat GmbH, 139 F.3d 877, 881, 45 USPQ2d 1977, 1981 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

To reject claims in an application under Section 103, an Examiner must show an un rebutted prima facie case of obviousness. See, In re Deuel, 51 F.3d 1552, 1557, 34 USPQ2d 1210, 1214 (Fed. Cir. 1995). In the absence of a proper prima facie case of obviousness, an applicant who complies with the other statutory requirements is entitled to a patent. See, In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992). It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has not met the required legal burden as set forth by the courts to substantiate valid rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 – 3, 10 – 15, 23 – 25, 27 – 29, 31, 35 – 38 and 40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanumgam et al. in view of Menditto et al. and AAPA. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Regarding claims 1, 10, 23, 28 and 35, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims. For example, none of the cited references disclose or suggest determining if a policy template is present at an enforcement point in response to receiving an identification assigned to the policy template, as recited in the claims of the present application. The Examiner appears to admit that Shanumgam et al. does not disclose or suggest these limitations but asserts that Meditto (col.3, lines 1-29, col. 6, lines 16-53, col. 9, lines 37-62, col. 12, line 20 – col. 13, line 6) discloses these limitations. However, Menditto merely discloses that a content gateway intercepts requests that are candidates for content processing, classifies them based on content, determines routing based on the content, and determines an appropriate content provider server location for routing the request as well as receives and installs policies, and that a content gateway directory stores content policies and includes a content class that consists of a template and a set of rules for pattern matching where the template is used to match a domain name and additional content of the request, and that there may be a content policy for a domain name within a content gateway policy manager since a valid domain name table may

not be able to hold every possible domain name that has associated content policy for execution, and that there are quality of service policies that are downloaded to a content gateway router and content policies that are distributed to content gateway processors, and details regarding the system diagram shown in Fig. 7. This is not determining if a policy template is present at an enforcement point in response to receiving an identification assigned to the policy template, as recited in the claims of the present application. The mention in Menditto of a “template” merely relates to a template containing domain names and content used to be compared with and match a domain name and content of a request. To put it another way, Menditto does not disclose or suggest receiving an identification assigned to a policy template, and then in response to receiving the identification, determining if a policy template that the identification is assigned is present at an enforcement point in response to, as recited in the claims of the present application. Further, the mere disclosure in Appendix A in Menditto of a policy ID field that contains a number that identifies the policy to be used by the CGR and other routers enroute for data transport does not disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application. Applicant submits the Examiner appears to use

Moreover, Applicant submits, as noted previously, that none of the cited references disclose or suggest the policy template and the parameters being transmitted separately, as recited in the claims of the present application. It is not clear which reference, or portion thereof, the Examiner asserts as disclosing these limitations. The Examiner references several portions of Menditto et al. However, none of these portions disclose or suggest the policy template and the parameters (to be used in the policy template) being transmitted separately. As required by the MPEP and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) statute and associated case law, Applicant submits that the Examiner fails to specifically point out where in any cited reference these limitations are disclosed or suggested. Applicant submits that the Examiner appears to misinterpret the Menditto et al. reference.



The Examiner further appears to admit that Shanumgam et al. does not disclose or suggest transmitting a query from the enforcement point to a repository, where policy templates are stored, in response to the policy template not being present at the enforcement point, wherein the query includes the id assigned to the policy template, but asserts that Menditto et al. discloses these limitations at column 3, lines 1 – 29, column 6, lines 16 – 53, column 9, lines 37 – 62 and column 12, line 20 – column 13, line 6. However, as noted previously, these portions merely disclose details regarding the content gateway functions, the content gateway directory, functions of the content gateway policy manager, and details related to quality of service policy. Again the Examiner jumps to various portions of the cited reference in the hopes that these portions disclose the limitations in the claims of the present application. The Examiner again fails to specifically point out the limitations in the claims of the present application in the cited reference. However, none of these portions disclose or suggest transmitting a query from the enforcement point to a repository, where policy templates are stored in response to the policy template not being present at the enforcement point, wherein the query includes the id assigned to the policy template, as recited in the claims of the present application. Menditto et al. actually teaches away from the limitations in the claims of the present application in disclosing that “if no policy exists, then no action is taken” (see, column 9, line 47). The Examiner fails to specifically point out where in the cited reference these limitations are disclosed or suggested. In addition, in contrast to the Examiner’s assertions, these limitations are not disclosed or suggested in AAPA.

Moreover, these portions do not disclose or suggest receiving the policy template at the enforcement point, wherein the policy template is transmitted by the repository in response to the query, as recited in the claims of the present application. Menditto et al. discloses storing of content policies. Further, Menditto et al. discloses a content class that consists of a template and set of rules for pattern matching the URL of the request. However, this is not a template that may receive parameters transmitted separately for factoring to the policy template, as recited in the claims of the present

application. Further, this is not a policy template present at an enforcement point. As the Examiner notes on page 5 of the Office Action, Menditto discloses a repository for content policy. This is not a policy template as recited in the claims of the present application. The Examiner appears to use impermissible hindsight in reading the limitations in the claims of the present application back into the cited reference.

Regarding claims 2, 3, 11 – 15, 24, 25, 27, 29, 31, 36 – 38 and 40, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 10, 23, 28, 35 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each claims 1 – 3, 10 – 15, 23 – 25, 27 – 29, 31, 35 – 38 and 40 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 6, 18, 32 and 41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanumgam et al., Menditto and further in view of Widegren et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and submits that these claims are dependent on one of 1, 10, 28 and 35 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. Applicant submits that Widegren et al. does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Shanumgam et al. and Menditto et al.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 6, 18, 32 and 41 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 7, 19, 20, 33 and 42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanumgam et al. in view of Menditto et al. and Daneili.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 10, 28 and 35 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. Applicant submits that Danieli does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Shanumgam et al. and Menditto et al.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 7, 19, 20, 33 and 42 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 8, 9, 21, 22, 34, 43 and 44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanumgam et al., Menditto et al. and further in view of Valente et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 10, 28 and 35 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. Applicant submits that Valente et al. does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Shanumgam et al. and Menditto et al.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 8, 9, 21, 22, 34, 43 and 44 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

#### **CLAIMS APPENDIX**

The attached Claims Appendix contains a copy of the claims involved in the appeal.

**EVIDENCE APPENDIX**

Applicant has not provided any evidence with this appeal and therefore an Evidence Appendix is not provided.


**RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**

Applicant is not providing copies of related decisions and therefore a Related Proceeding Appendix is not provided.

**CONCLUSION**

It is respectfully submitted that the above arguments show that each of claims 1 – 3, 6 – 15, 18 – 25, 27 – 29, 31 – 38 and 40 – 44 are patentable over the applied references. Based at least on these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that each of claims 1 – 3, 6 – 15, 18 – 25, 27 – 29, 31 – 38 and 40 – 44 defines patentable subject matter. The Examiner's rejections have been shown to be in clear error and lack essential elements of a rejection as required under 35 U.S.C. §103 and related case law, for the reasons stated above. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 1 – 3, 6 – 15, 18 – 25, 27 – 29, 31 – 38 and 40 – 44 set forth in the Office Action be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Date: April 21, 2009



Frederick D. Bailey  
Registration No. 42,282  
Moore & Van Allen PLLC  
P.O. Box 13706  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709  
Telephone: (919) 286-8000  
Facsimile: (919) 286-8199

**CLAIMS APPENDIX**

1. A method to distribute policies, comprising:

determining if a policy template is present at an enforcement point in response to receiving an identification (ID) assigned to the policy template at the enforcement point, wherein the policy template includes a form of “if a first parameter then a second parameter”, the policy template and the parameters being transmitted separately to reduce use of communication resources by factoring the template and parameters to be used in the template and to permit different parameters to be transmitted from time to time to replace previous parameters in the policy template without the need of transmitting the entire policy template again to further reduce use of communication resources;

transmitting a query from the enforcement point to a repository, where policy templates are stored, in response to the policy template not being present at the enforcement point, wherein the query includes the ID assigned to the policy template;

receiving the policy template at the enforcement point, wherein the policy template is transmitted by the repository in response to the query; and

receiving a set of parameters to be used in the policy template at the enforcement point, wherein the set of parameters are transmitted separately from the policy template.

2. The method of claim 1, binding the parameters to the policy template.

3. The method of claim 2, further comprising implementing the policy associated with the policy template.

4. – 5. Canceled

6. The method of claim 1, further comprising applying asynchronous, out-of-band communication to transmit the query and any policy templates.

7. The method of claim 1, further comprising compressing the policy template before transmitting to the enforcement point or any selected enforcement points.

8. The method of claim 1, further comprising forming the policy template in a structured document.

9. The method of claim 1, further comprising forming the policy template in a mark-up language.

10. A method to distribute policies, comprising:

- defining a policy template associated with each policy, wherein the policy template includes a form of "if a first parameter then a second parameter", the policy template and the parameters being transmitted separately to reduce use of communication resources by factoring the template and parameters to be used in the template and to permit different parameters to be transmitted from time to time to replace previous parameters in the policy template to change the policy associated with the policy template without the need of transmitting the entire policy or policy template again to further reduce use of communication resources;
- assigning a unique identification (ID) to each policy template;
- storing each policy template and assigned ID;
- transmitting only the assigned ID to an enforcement point for each policy to be enforced by the enforcement point, wherein only the ID is transmitted to the enforcement point rather than the policy template to substantially minimize use of data processing and communication resources;

determining if the policy template corresponding to any transmitted ID is present at the enforcement point;

transmitting a query to a policy template repository in response to the policy template corresponding to any transmitted ID not being present at the enforcement point, wherein the query includes the ID for any policy template not present at the enforcement point; and

transmitting the policy template from the policy template repository to the enforcement point in response to the query including the ID for the policy template.

11. The method of claim 10, further comprising identifying at least one set of parameters to be associated with each policy template.

12. The method of claim 11, further comprising transmitting the one set of parameters to be used in each associated policy template for enforcement to the enforcement point.

13. The method of claim 12, further comprising binding the parameters to each associated template.

14. The method of claim 13, further comprising implementing the policy associated with each policy template.

15. The method of claim 11, further comprising storing each one of the at least one set of parameters by name and type.

16. – 17. Canceled.

18. The method of claim 10, further comprising applying asynchronous, out-of-band communication to query the repository and transmit any templates.

19. The method of claim 10, further comprising compressing each template before transmitting to the enforcement point.

20. The method of claim 10, further comprising compressing each template before transmitting to the enforcement point.

21. The method of claim 10, further comprising forming each policy template in a structured document.

22. The method of claim 10, further comprising forming each policy template in a mark-up language.

23. A system to distribute policies, comprising:

- a policy administrator to define policy templates and to transmit one of an identification (ID) assigned to a policy template or the policy template associated with each policy to be enforced, wherein each policy template includes a form of "if a first parameter then a second parameter", each policy template and associated parameters being transmitted separately to reduce use of communication resources by factoring the template and associated parameters to be used in the template and to permit different parameters to be transmitted from time to time to replace previous parameters in the policy template without the need of transmitting the entire policy template again to further reduce use of communication resources;
- an enforcement point to receive the ID assigned to the policy template or the policy template for each policy and to enforce each policy; and



a repository to store each policy template and assigned ID, wherein the enforcement point determines if the policy template is present at the enforcement point in response to receiving the ID assigned to the policy template and transmits a query to the repository in response to the policy template not being present at the enforcement point.

24. The system of claim 23, wherein each policy administrator comprises a processor to transmit one of the ID assigned to the policy template or the policy template associated with each policy.

25. The system of claim 23, wherein each enforcement point comprises:  
a processor to receive the IDs assigned to each policy template; and  
a data source to store each policy template for enforcement and assigned ID, wherein the processor forms and transmits the query in response to each policy template corresponding to any transmitted IDs not present in the data source.

26. Canceled

27. The system of claim 23, further comprising a server to interface between each policy administrator, each enforcement point and the repository.

28. A system to distribute policies, comprising:  
means for defining a policy template associated with each policy, wherein the policy template includes a form of "if a first parameter then a second parameter", the policy template and the parameters being transmitted separately to reduce use of communication resources by factoring the template and parameters to be used in the template and to permit different parameters to be transmitted from time to time to

replace previous parameters in the policy template without the need of transmitting the entire policy template again to further reduce use of communication resources;

means for assigning a unique identification (ID) to each policy template;

a repository to store each policy template and assigned ID;

means for transmitting one of the assigned ID or the policy template for each policy to be enforced;

an enforcement point to receive the assigned ID or the policy template for each policy and to enforce each policy; and

means for transmitting a query to a policy template repository in response to each policy template corresponding to any transmitted IDs not being present at the enforcement point, wherein the query includes any transmitted IDs for any policy templates not present at the enforcement point.

29. The system of claim 28, further comprising means for binding parameters to each associated policy template for enforcement.

30. Canceled.

31. The system of claim 28, further comprising means for transmitting any policy templates to the enforcement point in response to the query from the enforcement point including any IDs assigned to the policy templates.

32. The system of claim 31, further comprising means for applying asynchronous, out-of-band communication to transmit the query and any policy templates.

33. The system of claim 31, further comprising means for compressing each policy template before transmission to the enforcement point.

34. The system of claim 28, further comprising means for forming each policy template in a structured document.

35. A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method, comprising:

- defining a policy template associated with each policy, wherein the policy template includes a form of “if a first parameter then a second parameter”, the policy template and the parameters being transmitted separately to reduce use of communication resources by factoring the template and parameters to be used in the template and to permit different parameters to be transmitted from time to time to replace previous parameters in the policy template without the need of transmitting the entire policy template again to further reduce use of communication resources;

- assigning a unique identification (ID) to each policy template;

- transmitting one of the assigned ID or the policy template to an enforcement point for each policy to be enforced by the enforcement point; and

- querying a policy template repository in response to each policy template corresponding to any transmitted IDs not being present at the enforcement point.

36. The computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 35, further comprising:

- identifying at least one set of parameters to be associated with each policy template; and

- transmitting the one set of parameters to be used in each associated policy template for enforcement to the enforcement point.

37. The computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 36, further comprising binding the parameters to each

associated template.

38. The computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 35, further comprising implementing the policy associated with each policy template.

39. Canceled.

40. The computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 35, further comprising transmitting any policy templates to the enforcement point in response to the query from the enforcement point including any IDs assigned to the policy templates.

41. The computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 40, further comprising applying asynchronous, out-of-band communication to query the repository and to transmit any policy templates.

42. The computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 35, further comprising compressing each template before transmitting to the enforcement point.

43. The computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 35, further comprising forming each policy template in a structured document.

44. The computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 35, further comprising forming each policy template in a mark-up language.